

THE ISSUE OF FACT  
BETWEEN  
BISHOP COXE AND  
PROFESSOR SEYMOUR.

---

BX5935  
.I86



BX 59.35.

I.86

EX-1755  
I 86

✓

THE ISSUE OF FACT

BETWEEN

BISHOP COXE AND PROFESSOR SEYMOUR.

EVIDENCE UNDER OATH.

One of the most painful and distressing results of the long secret session of the General Convention, is the forcing upon me a direct issue of veracity with the Bishop of Western New York. In regard to this, I would cheerfully keep silence and bear the injustice, did it concern only the question of the Bishopric of Illinois, which I never sought or desired : but since it bears wholly upon the discharge of my present duties as acting Dean of the Seminary, it is unhappily my duty, so long as I remain in this position, to defend myself from any charges which would weaken the confidence of the Church in the institution.

On the seventh day of the secret session and only about two hours before the time first fixed for the decisive vote, Judge Sheffey of Virginia read the first of the following letters. He had it in his possession, I have been told, four days before it was read ; and I am informed that when asked by one of my friends for a copy of it in advance, he refused, on the ground that he was specially charged only to read it to the House, and to show it to none but to certain members. After it was read, a copy was again refused, on the ground that it was "in the possession of the House," and that the proceedings were "secret." When the obligation of secrecy was removed, a copy was unattainable, because the documents were "in the hands of the printer." The first sight of them was gained only on the Friday evening after the question was decided, when I received proof-sheets containing the letters. And since then Mr. William Welsh of Pennsylvania, through whom the second and third letters of Bishop Coxe were brought before the House of Deputies, on the last day of the secret session, has published a letter in corroboration of them, which he inserted in the last number of the Daily Churchman, to which, of course, that issue being the last, there could be no reply through the same channel. I mention these facts, not to complain of anything which others have done conscientiously, or which they regard as the work of a special "Providence"; but simply to explain the disadvantages under which I have labored in learning the exact nature of the charges, and the necessary delay that has occurred in preparing my defence. Moreover, the charges against me rest solely on the statement of one man ; and the only corroboration is what Mr. Welsh says, that somebody else says, that

he remembers hearing said, a year and a half ago. On the contrary, every word of my statement which follows next after the Letters of Bishop Coxe, and every word of the evidence given by the Rev. Mr. Grafton and others who were present, and knew the facts of their own knowledge, is given under the solemn sanction of an oath. The result is humbly left in the hands of God, and to the judgment of all honest men.

GEORGE F. SEYMOUR.

General Theological Seminary, Nov. 5, 1874.

### BISHOP COXE'S LETTER.

#### I.

[Read by Judge Sheffey, of Virginia, on Wednesday afternoon, the 21st of October :]

NEW YORK, Oct. 17, 1874.

MY DEAR JUDGE SMITH :

The facts are substantially as they have been reported to you. I could say many things in favor of this Candidate with entire truth, and testimonials might be multiplied in his favor without any duplicity. But *the whole truth* would reveal another class of facts, and I suppose Dr. S. himself would not deny that, as a Professor in the Seminary, he has steadfastly resisted the noble efforts of his colleagues, such as Drs. Seabury and Vinton, who have labored to maintain the doctrine of this Church, respecting the Holy Eucharist, and the provisions of the Rubric for its solemn celebration, *pure and undefiled*.

These things became known to me in the discharge of official duty as a "Visitor" and a member of a Committee, and I regret to say that the learned Professor was forced to confess to me that, *with his knowledge and consent*, a reverend gentleman, well known as an active agent of the C. B. S., or of the system it sustains, was permitted to lecture to students of the Seminary, in a private room, on his peculiar views of the "HOLY EUCHARIST."

It is with extreme regret that I mention these facts, which I have desired an opportunity of stating in the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, and only there. As you well know, however, the impossibility of assembling that Board, or any fair proportion of them, has operated to render the *investigation of facts* an impossibility for many years. The facts ought to be known, however, and the Church must be awakened to her responsibilities in such momentous concerns.

Faithfully yours,

(Signed)

A. CLEVELAND COXE,

Bishop of Western New York.

The Hon. JUDGE SMITH.

#### II.

[Mr. William Welsh, of Pennsylvania, on Thursday, Oct. 22d, introduced the following correspondence :]

NEW YORK, Oct. 21, 1874.

MY DEAR BISHOP :

By a remarkable Providence, a letter of yours dated Oct. 4, 1873, came into my possession this evening. I enclose it to you, and ask permission to use it at my discretion. If you ever conversed with

any of your students about the visits of the Rev. Mr. Grafton to the Seminary, or have any particulars of such visits, and the knowledge that the Rev. Dr. Seymour had of them, pray oblige me with such particulars. Yours, very sincerely,

W. WELSH.

To Rt. Rev. A. C. COXE, D.D.

NEW YORK, Oct. 21, 1874.

MY DEAR MR. WELSH :

I do not feel at liberty to refuse you the use of my letter of Oct. 4, 1873, the existence of which I had quite forgotten. But consult with my friend, Judge Smith, who knows the extreme reluctance with which I have permitted my testimony to be used in your discussions.

I might have made my statement much stronger and more detailed ; for the case was a very gross abuse of power. We do not send our candidates to the Seminary to be instructed by emissaries from foreign societies ; but when I expressed my surprise to Dr. Seymour that a volunteer Professor had been introduced by him within the walls of the Seminary, he defended himself on the general ground that the person was "a presbyter of the Church."

In reply to another question, I must add that in examining one of my candidates, who reluctantly admitted his knowledge of the facts, I found that he had been present at one of these volunteer lectures, in which extravagant and false views of the Holy Eucharist were inculcated. Nothing but a very extraordinary duplicity can put any construction on these facts, which good men can accept as satisfactory. Faithfully yours,

A. CLEVELAND COXE, Bishop of Western New York.

WM. WELSH, Esq.

BUFFALO, Oct. 4, 1873.

MY DEAR DR. FORBES :

Nothing could be more opportune—nothing more *ad rem*—than the publication, *at this moment*, with historical notes, of this very valuable document. I send it by the same post that takes this, having obtained Prof. Seabury's permission to hold it, against some such emergency, which I foresaw must arise before our Reform work is much further advanced. I was sorry I could not see you when I was last in town ; but things have gone on well, in some respects ; and this explosion of the "C. B. S." will work much good.

I think *historical* notes are needed, and the whole should be prefaced by an extract from that document, showing the nature of their intrigues, and how they glory in stultifying the discipline and destroying the official relations of the Dean to the students.

I have the present (acting) Dean's own acknowledgment that he permitted "Father Grafton" to visit and indoctrinate the students last Winter.

If you don't publish the accompanying document, please give it back to Prof. Seabury ; only asking him to consider my permission to make further use of it, as not withdrawn. We may have to convince the whole Church of the impossibility of working the Seminary as it is now going on. Faithfully yours,

A. CLEVELAND COXE,

Bishop Western New York.

The Rev. Dr. FORBES, &c., &c., &c.

## STATEMENT IN REPLY.

IT IS NOT TRUE that I ever "*introduced*" Father Grafton as "a volunteer Professor" "within the walls of the Seminary,"—having never introduced or even invited him to the Seminary in any capacity.

IT IS NOT TRUE that I "permitted" Father Grafton "to visit and indoctrinate the students last Winter," or at any other time, having never been asked for, and having never given, any permission of the kind.

IT IS NOT TRUE that he "was permitted" by me "*to lecture to students of the Seminary in a private room,*" as if I were ashamed or afraid to ask him to do it openly. No person has ever been permitted by me to lecture to the students except openly in the Chapel or Library, and with the knowledge of the Faculty.

IT IS NOT TRUE that I ever "*confessed*" to, or "*acknowledged,*" any such action as is denied in the above three paragraphs; for I have never thought it honest to confess or acknowledge what I never had done.

IT IS NOT TRUE that I was "*forced*" to confess it: for no compulsion can well draw from me, to my own prejudice, a false confession of a thing which I never had done. Every statement ever made by me at any time on this subject, has been freely and voluntarily made.

IT IS NOT TRUE that the Bishop has "*my own acknowledgment* that I permitted 'Father Grafton' to visit and indoctrinate" as aforesaid; for I never made any acknowledgment of the sort.

IT IS NOT TRUE that Father Grafton lectured at the Seminary "*with my knowledge and consent,*" for I knew nothing of his lecturing until some days after it was all over, and never gave any consent thereto.

IT IS NOT TRUE that the object of Father Grafton's lectures was to inculcate "*his peculiar views of the Holy Eucharist,*" for the students who were present testify that there was only one incidental allusion to the Holy Eucharist during the two evenings.

IT IS NOT TRUE that, in this incidental allusion, "*extravagant and false views* of the Holy Eucharist were inculcated," unless it be "extravagant and false" to say that the benefit received in the Holy Communion will be in proportion to the intensity of the Faith of the devout receiver, conducing sometimes even to the recovery from bodily disease. This remark was made in *disproof* of the assertion of Romanists that Sacramental Grace among us is without efficacy. The explanation here given is drawn from notes of Father Grafton's lectures, taken at the time by one of the students present, but which I never saw or heard of until after my Confirmation was defeated.

IT IS NOT TRUE that in this matter there was "*a very gross abuse of power*" on my part; for there was no exercise of power at all, nor any knowledge, at the time, on which any power could be exercised.

IT IS NOT TRUE that Bishop Coxe obtained his version of the matter when he was in the Seminary as a "*Visitor*" of the same in the Spring of 1873. For at that Visitation, the moment the fact of Father Grafton's lectures was mentioned, I stated to him, in terms too strong and clear to permit the possibility of mistake, that those lectures *were delivered without my knowledge or consent*, and that if I had known of them in time *I should certainly have prohibited them*. The Bishop then asked, how such a man was allowed to set foot upon the Seminary grounds at all; and used very harsh language touching Father Grafton, saying



that I ought to have "taken him by the neck and marched him off the grounds," or words to that effect. It was in reply to this denial of a right even to visit a student whom he happened to know, that some things were said, which have been altogether misapplied. It should be remembered that the Seminary students are almost all college graduates; and that the Seminary course corresponds to a post-graduate course. No American College undertakes to prevent students from ever receiving a friend as a visitor in their private rooms, unless previous permission has been received from the President. In a post-graduate course such a severity of exclusion would not be submitted to for a moment, and ought not to be, by any body of American young men. It would be more absurd, if possible, to require it of young men preparing for the Holy Ministry than of those preparing for any other profession, such as the Law, or Medicine. It has never at any time been attempted in the General Theological Seminary, since its foundation to the present day. And when the Bishop stated that it was my duty to eject Father Grafton summarily by physical force, I ventured to remind him that the Rev. Father Grafton was a Presbyterian of the Church in good standing, that he was second to no man in the Church or out of it in all that appertains to personal character, social position or holiness of life; and that every respectable person—Bishop, priest, deacon, or layman—had the free *entrée* to visit his friends among the students, as in every other American Seminary, without obtaining special permission for each special visit. This was the only connection in which anything was said of Father Grafton's right as "a Presbyterian of the Church."

I would add here that such extemporized private meetings among the students, though rare, have not been unprecedented. Some years ago, the Rev. Dr. Breck found himself beset by a crowd of young men in the room of a student whom he was visiting, and they persuaded him to relate the history of Nashotah, though the Dean and Professors knew nothing of it until some days after. Still later, a similar thing took place during a visit by Bishop Tozer; and on neither occasion was any fault found by the Dean or Faculty, though no permission had been asked or given.

IT IS NOT TRUE that I have "steadfastly resisted the noble efforts of my colleagues . . . to maintain the doctrine of this Church respecting the Holy Eucharist." This construction of the course which I pursued in opposing an entirely novel, despotic, and un-American *policy of discipline*, was energetically disclaimed by me at the beginning, was reiterated by me at every stage of our unhappy controversy on the subject, and was finally abandoned by the very colleagues who made it, when, in the presence of the Bishops as Visitors, they signed their names to a declaration that what they had done "was not intended to impeach the general conduct and teaching of Dr. Seymour, either as a Professor of the Seminary, or as a Presbyterian of the Church."

It may be true that Bishop Coxe has "*desired* an opportunity of stating in the Board of Trustees, and only there," his version of the Grafton incident. But he has been present at all the three meetings of the Board held since his visitation, and has never given the slightest evidence of his desire, by word or deed.

It is now left to all unprejudiced and candid persons, to consider the above, together with the sworn evidence which follows, and then

say whether, in regard to my acts, there be any foundation for Bishop Coxe's assertion that "nothing but a very extraordinary duplicity can put any construction on these facts, which good men can accept as satisfactory."

GEORGE F. SEYMOUR.

Sworn to before me the 6th day of November, 1874.

O. P. SMITH, Notary Public, New York county.

I, Randall Cooke Hall, a Presbyter of the Diocese of New York, and a Professor in the General Theological Seminary, was present at the Visitation held by Bishop Coxe in the Spring of 1873, referred to by Professor Seymour in his above affidavit, and I hereby testify under oath that to the best of my recollection, knowledge, and belief, Professor Seymour's statement of what took place on that occasion is substantially correct.

RANDALL COOKE HALL.

Sworn to before me the 6th day of November, 1874.

O. P. SMITH, Notary Public, New York county.

I, Charles C. Grafton, of Boston, Massachusetts, Presbyter, Rector of the Church of the Advent in that city, on oath say :

I have been informed that the Rev. Dr. Seymour, acting Dean of the General Theological Seminary, New York, has been charged with inviting or permitting me to deliver, or in some way countenancing me in the delivery of a lecture or address on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, or on the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, in private, to the students of the Seminary. I hereby declare this to be untrue.

I would further say that the only visits I have ever made to the Seminary, since Dr. Seymour's connection with it as Dean or Professor, are the following : When I was in this country for a few weeks in 1867, I spent two evenings in a friend's room in the Seminary. Dr. Seymour was not Dean, and had nothing whatever to do with my visits by invitation or otherwise. I talked with some of the students who came in to see me on the Religious Life, and said nothing concerning the Holy Communion. I never learned from any one that my visit was objectionable to any of the Faculty.

I was there again in 1872, on my return to this country from England, under the following circumstances : Having occasion to be in New York while my brother's house was closed, I was asked by a student whom I had invited to become one of my curates, and who was considering the matter, to come and occupy for a night or two a vacant bed-room that was at his disposal, his room-mate being absent. I did so, and quite informally, and without any previous arrangement or plan on my part, several of the students came in (some invited by him, others at their own motion); and, at their request, I talked to them on the Spiritual Life and its temptations. I believe I said something afterwards against the claims of the Roman Church, and I may have answered a question about the Holy Communion. I have forgotten what.

I am the better able to recall the subject of the evening's topic, because I stated it to the students of the Protestant Episcopal Seminary at Cambridge, Mass., in the presence of one of the Professors, the Rev. Dr. Wharton, when I visited that institution and addressed the students, at his invitation and in his presence. I have no reason



whatever to believe that Dr. Seymour had any knowledge of this interview, in my friend's room, with the students.

My acquaintance with Professor Seymour is very slight ; and on the one or two occasions when we have met, I have never mentioned to him the fact that I had an interview, such as I have described, with the students, for I never supposed it a matter of importance.

Since 1872 I have been at the Seminary but twice, each time on private business only, and on neither occasion having any conference with any of the students on religious matters. These are all the visits I have made to the Seminary.

I have spoken of visits to the Seminary. It may be proper to add that I have never had any conference with any of the students away from the Seminary, by the invitation, permission, or procurement, directly or indirectly, of Dr. Seymour.

I will further state that, although a member of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament when residing in England, I gave up all active connection with it on returning to this country, and left it declining, on this ground, an invitation extended to me by the Confraternity here to join it ; and on no occasion have I talked to the students concerning this Society, its organization, workings, or belief.

CHARLES C. GRAFTON.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, SUFFOLK COUNTY : At Boston, in said county, this 6th day of November, A. D. 1874, personally appeared the Rev. Charles C. Grafton, and made solemn oath that the

{  
SEAL  
}

foregoing affidavit, by him subscribed, is true, before me,  
N. AUSTIN PARKS, Notary Public.

I, George Henry Higgins, a presbyter of the Diocese of Illinois, rector of the Parish of Trinity in the city of Lincoln, in the State of Illinois, having seen in public print, certain statements having reference to the Rev. G. F. Seymour, D.D., and the General Theological Seminary in the city of New York, and knowing of my own knowledge that such statements are false, and as I believe, are uttered with intention to deceive, do now, from a sense of right and duty make the following true relation of facts :

1st. That I entered the Junior Class in the General Theological Seminary in the Fall of the year 1870, and that I graduated therefrom and received my diploma in the year 1873 ; that during the terms of each year I was resident in the Seminary, occupying during my whole course room 5 in the East Building ;

That during my course I was socially intimate with one Henry M. Torbert, now a priest of the Diocese of New York, then a member of my class, and resident in the same East Building of the General Theological Seminary ;

That at the time mentioned in the false statements above referred to, I was invited by the said Mr. H. M. Torbert, to meet in his room the Rev. C. C. Grafton of Boston, who was temporarily in the city of New York, on his way to or from Boston ;

That I accepted the invitation, and met besides the Rev. Mr. Grafton three or four of my fellow students whom I knew as the intimate friends of Mr. Torbert ; the evening was passed in pleasant general conversation, and towards its close, a suggestion was made either by myself or by one of the students present, that if Mr. Grafton's stay in New York was prolonged over the one night, we

might be allowed to meet him again the next evening, and that he would tell us something of the work carried on by the Order of St. John the Evangelist ; that by permission of Mr. Torbert, asked and obtained, I invited other of my friends among the students to be present ;

That on the second evening we met some additional students invited by Mr. Torbert, and all having been introduced to Mr. Grafton, we recited the hymn "Come, Holy Ghost," and the Lord's Prayer, after which Mr. Grafton gave a short lecture of instruction and advice relative to the ministerial life, which he founded on the counsels of our Lord mentioned in the 7th and 19th chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel. After singing the hymn, and the benediction, the students dispersed with remarks of approbation and thanks to the reverend gentleman for his timely and acceptable counsels ;

That I am fully persuaded this was the only time during my stay in the Seminary that Mr. Grafton met any of the students in such manner, and I positively assert that on this occasion it arose solely from the courtesy of Mr. Torbert and our own utterly unpremeditated action thereupon.

Furthermore, That about two weeks after the event just related, the Professor of Systematic Theology stated to our class during recitation that the Head of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament had been visiting the Seminary, and had there propagated its abominable opinions, or words of like effect, and this statement being so utterly foreign to what really took place as above stated at Mr. Grafton's visit, was received by the students with a great deal of merriment, and I desire to state that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the Rev. Dr. Seymour was totally ignorant of all and any part of the occurrence, until the rumor of the assertion made by the Professor of Systematic Theology brought the matter to his notice.

Since that time I have twice seen in the columns of The Church Journal, the same utterly false statement in regard to the C. B. S. and the visit of Mr. Grafton to the Seminary ; Therefore I desire to state as one of the parties by whom the matter originated, that each and every statement of the matter which differs from the account given above and the statements made below, is utterly false and unreliable :

1. The visit of Mr. Grafton was of a private social nature and to Mr. Torbert.

2. The first evening we met Mr. Grafton socially as the friends of Mr. Torbert.

3. That the meeting of the second evening was simply the result of an unpremeditated request made by us, the students present.

4. That nothing in regard to the Holy Communion was the subject matter of either evening.

5. That nothing in regard to the existence, the affairs, or the doctrines of the C. B. S., was so much as mentioned, nor was anything said which could possibly be construed or misconstrued into having any relation thereto.

6. From the manner in which the meeting originated, it was impossible for any one to have knowledge thereof except the students invited.

7. The meeting was in no wise secret, but was the subject of general conversation for two or three days afterward.

8. That the Rev. Dr. Seymour knew nothing whatever of the meeting.

9. That the whole matter of Mr. Grafton's address related to the personal purity of life necessary for those who are called to Holy Orders.

G. HENRY HIGGINS.

{ SEAL } Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 28th day of October, A. D. 1874.

HENRY W. DANA, Notary Public.

We, members of the Senior Class in the General Theological Seminary, make the following statement of facts :

We were present on the occasion of the delivery of two discourses by the Rev. C. C. Grafton, in a student's room, on the evenings of Dec. 11th and 12th, 1872. We were there, with some twenty others, at the invitation of the occupant of the room, whom Mr. Grafton was visiting.

We had no reason to believe that the meetings were effected or authorized by the Dean ; and the fact of their being held in a private room would give the impression that the student acted on his own responsibility.

The discourses were, on the first evening, on the temptations peculiar to the clerical life ; and on the second evening he presented the arguments for the so-called religious life. No mention was made of the "C. B. S.," and only an incidental allusion to the Holy Eucharist.

We have digests made immediately after the discourses were delivered, which are at the disposal of any one concerned.

(Present Dec. 12th only,)

F. W. TOMKINS, JR.,

FRANK SMITH,

AMOS T. ASHTON,

ROBERT WYLLIE.

(Present Dec. 11th only,)

Robt. B. Drane declined to be present because he understood that the Dean knew nothing about the matter.

Sworn to before me this 2d day of November, 1874.

O. P. SMITH,

Notary Public, New York county.

{ F. W. TOMKINS, JR.,

FRANK SMITH,

AMOS T. ASHTON,

ROBERT WYLLIE,

{ ROBT. B. DRANE.

In the Fall of 1872, my room-mate, now the Rev. H. M. Torbert, Priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, invited the Rev. C. C. Grafton of Boston, Mass., to call on him at the General Theological Seminary.

At this time I was boarding outside of the Seminary, and having no use for my bed there, I wrote to the Rev. Mr. Grafton, and asked him to occupy my room.

Mr. Grafton accepted my invitation, and spent the nights of Wednesday and Thursday, Dec. 11th and 12th, 1872, in my room.

On Wednesday evening, Dec. 11th, Mr. Torbert invited some of the students to call on the Rev. Mr. Grafton in our room.

There, at the request of some of these students, the Rev. Mr. Grafton talked, in an informal manner, on the subject of the Spiritual Life.

His conversation was *not* in reference to the Holy Eucharist, and

he did not *allude* to the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament so far as I remember.

Neither Mr. Torbert nor myself invited the Rev. Mr. Grafton to the Seminary for the purpose of delivering a lecture on the Holy Eucharist. Mr. Torbert desired to consult him on personal matters.


I was not present on Thursday evening.

This was the only occasion, during my Seminary course (from the Fall of 1871 until June, 1874), that any such thing took place, so far as I know or believe. Had any such thing occurred, I should doubtless have heard of it.

The Dean of the Seminary, the Rev. Geo. F. Seymour, D.D., knew nothing of the interview which the Rev. Mr. Grafton had with the students, from me, until after Mr. Grafton had left the city, and, so far as I remember, I never told him of it.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, County of Essex, ss.: Wynant Vanderpool, of full age, being duly sworn, on his oath saith that the above statement, so far as his own acts are concerned, is true and accurate, and that so far as the acts of others are concerned, he believes the same to be true, according the best of his knowledge and information.

Sworn and subscribed, at Newark, N. J., this

	2d day of November, A. D. 1874, before me, W. VANDERPOOL, U. S. Commissioner.	}	WYNANT VANDERPOOL.
---	---	---	--------------------

Having heard from various sources that the Rev. George F. Seymour, D.D., Dean of the General Theological Seminary, has been charged with inviting to that Institution, in the years 1872 or 1873, the Rev. C. C. Grafton, rector of the Church of the Advent, Boston, for the purpose of lecturing to the students of the Seminary upon the subject of the Holy Eucharist, I desire to make the following statement:

I was a member of the General Theological Seminary in the years 1872 and 1873, and during that time the Rev. C. C. Grafton never remained but two nights at the Seminary, and to my certain knowledge that visit was made at the especial request of the gentleman who entertained him. And I have the very best reason to believe that the Rev. Dr. Seymour did not know of the Rev. C. C. Grafton's intention to visit the Seminary previous to his arrival upon the ground. Furthermore, neither at that time or at any other time while I was in the Seminary, did the Rev. C. C. Grafton, either in a private room or any other room connected with the Institution, lecture upon the subject of the Holy Eucharist.

He did, however, at the request of a number of the students, talk to the gentlemen who, by invitation of the person who was entertaining him, were assembled in the room where he was stopping. The subject upon which he spoke was suggested by ourselves. It was "The Temptations and Trials incident to a Student's Life." As he was to remain in the Seminary over a second night, at our request he talked to the young men the following evening. At that time he spoke of the theory of the life to which he had devoted himself, and of the work in which he was engaged.

The community life had, and continues to have, the most decided approval of a number of the Bishops of the English and American Churches, and the students felt, as doubtless did the Rev. Mr. Graf-

ton, that he was doing no more wrong in talking thus informally to us upon the above subjects, than if he had chosen the prophecies or the inspiration of Holy Scriptures as his topics. If he mentioned the subject of the Holy Eucharist, it was in the most incidental way. Certainly he did not give enough prominence to it to arouse any feeling, or even comment, from those who possibly may have differed from him.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this,  
3d day of November, 1874,  
JAMES M. KNAPP, Justice of the Peace. } JOSEPH H. JOHNSON.

NEWBURGH, N. Y., Nov. 2d, 1874.

MY DEAR DR. SEYMOUR :

Having noticed in the *New York Times* a statement to the effect that Bishop Coxe had sent a letter, or letters, to one or more Deputies of the Lower House of the General Convention, which were read before the Convention, declaring that you had invited the Rev. Father Grafton of the Church of the Advent, Boston, to lecture to the students on the subject of the Holy Communion, for the purpose of having them indoctrinated in what are known as "advanced" views on this holy mystery, I determined to write to you, to correct as far as I am able this false statement of Bishop Coxe, and to explain to you the real facts of the case, and how Father Grafton came to be within the Seminary close. I feel that this statement of Bishop Coxe must have taken you as much by surprise as it has me.

One day during the latter part of the year 1872, my friend and classmate, Harry Torbert, now abroad, came to my room and told me that Father Grafton was in the city, and that he intended to call on him that evening at the Seminary; and he further said wouldn't it be nice to invite a few of the fellows in my room to meet him, and he might give us a little talk. I said it would be very nice indeed. But let us make it a general invitation to all the men, no matter what their views may be. He agreed with me, and we invited every man in the Seminary. The Father remained two days, and on the two successive evenings he spoke to us upon the elementary principles of the Christian Life, and "The Religious Life." The first evening it was a very general talk on the trials and temptations of the Christian Life and how to meet them. The second evening it was on the Religious Life, referring to the Order of St. John the Evangelist. I declare most emphatically that the subject of the *Holy Eucharist* was not once mentioned, in a controversial manner or otherwise, and if alluded to at all, it was in the most incidental manner, on the first evening, when speaking of the trials and temptations of the Christian life. It is a very sad thing for me to know that Bishop Coxe could have made so untruthful a statement, because he must have been better informed. There were present *three* of his own men on one of the evenings referred to, and *two* on the other. So had he chosen to have been informed of the exact nature of the lectures of the Rev. Mr. Grafton, he could easily have done so.

During my entire course at the Seminary, I have never known of any other Presbyter of the Church (or layman) to give talk or lectures to the students without the knowledge or consent of the Faculty. I regret exceedingly *now* that we had not first obtained your consent, for the Rev. Mr. Grafton's; but coming as he did as a friend of one of us, and without any intention or idea of meeting any of the



students, his talk was as much a surprise to himself as it was a pleasure and benefit to us. We did not think we were violating any of the rules of the Seminary. Trusting that this letter may prove of some benefit to you, I remain, my dear Doctor, faithfully your friend and brother in Christ,

GEO. W. HINKLE.

The REV. G. F. SEYMOUR, D.D.

Sworn to before me, by GEO. W. HINKLE, this 2d day of November 1874.

M. H. HINCHBEY,

Notary Public in and for Orange county.

In the Winter of 1872 one of my fellow-students in the General Theological Seminary, now the Rev. H. M. Torbert, informed me that he was expecting a visit from the Rev. C. C. Grafton of Boston, Mass.

I told Mr. Torbert that I would like very much to meet the Rev. Mr. Grafton. I also remarked that there were other students in the Seminary of the same mind. The day the Rev. Mr. Grafton arrived at the Seminary, Mr. Torbert and I agreed that we would each at supper time invite such students to his (Mr. Torbert's) room, as we thought would like to meet him.

When we were assembled there were so many present, and there was so little opportunity for each individual to converse with the Rev. Mr. Grafton, that it was suggested that he make some sort of an address. Upon his inquiring what he should speak about, "The Spiritual Life" and "Personal Religion" were suggested as topics. Accordingly he addressed us at some length in quite an informal way on the above-mentioned subjects.

Having concluded he asked us to unite with him in prayer.

The prayers used were Collects from the Prayer Book.

The next evening at supper I again assisted in inviting students to Mr. Torbert's room.

When all were assembled, twice as many being present as on the previous evening, all shades of Seminary theological opinions being represented, the Rev. Mr. Grafton introduced his remarks by saying that there were certain counsels in Holy Scripture which were intended by our Blessed Lord for those who could receive them. He cited St. Matthew xix., 16th to end, as substantiating the statement. He illustrated his remarks principally by means of St. Matthew x. He closed by calling our attention to the lives of the Holy Apostles, and spoke of the revival of the "Religious Life" in our own Church.

I am unable to recall any allusions to the Holy Eucharist in either address.

The C. B. S. was not mentioned.

There was some discussion the next day among the students with regard to what had been said, but it arose principally from his interpretation of St. Matthew xix.

It was without the permission, consent, or knowledge, of the Rev. Geo. F. Seymour, D.D., Dean of the Seminary, that the offer of hospitality was extended to the Rev. C. C. Grafton, that the several students were invited to the room for the purpose of meeting him, and that the suggestions as to the topics upon which he should talk were made.

WALTER RUSSELL GARDNER, Deacon

of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New York  
Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 7th day of November, 1874.

WILLIAM L. DELACEY, Justice of the Peace, Amenia, N. Y.



PHOTOMOUNT  
PAMPHLET BINDER



*Manufactured by*  
**GAYLORD BROS. Inc.**  
Syracuse, N. Y.  
Stockton, Calif.

BX5935 .I86

The issue of fact between Bishop Cox

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00050 8566